

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,169,984 to Bogdan ("*Bogdan*").

Claims 1 and 3-37 are pending in the application.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims as anticipated by the *Bogdan*. In order to properly establish that *Bogdan* anticipates Applicant's claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of each of the claims in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in that single reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." See M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1 recites a computer program product to execute a method including:

detecting a user navigation input comprising one of a forward user navigation input or a backward user navigation input, a forward user navigation input comprising a forward modifier key press combined with a key press of a group identifier character, and a backward user navigation input comprising a backward modifier key press combined with a key press of a group identifier character

(emphasis added). *Bogdan* does not disclose or even suggest at least this element of claim 1.

¹ The Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

The Final Office Action seems to allege that the global incremental type search system of *Bogdan* discloses forward and backward navigation among groups. (Final Office Action at 2, 3, and 9). Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Bogdan* teaches recursively searching a component hierarchy as a user incrementally types in a search term. (Fig. 4; Col. 7, lines 6-8 and 27-44). However, nothing in *Bogdan* discloses forward or backward modifier keys, or forward or backward navigation through a component hierarchy. *Bogdan* does not disclose “a forward user navigation input comprising a forward modifier key press combined with a key press of a group identifier character, and a backward user navigation input comprising a backward modifier key press combined with a key press of a group identifier character,” as recited in claim 1.

Bogdan fails to teach at least the above elements and, accordingly, cannot anticipate claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore allowable. Independent claims 9, 13, 18, 23, and 27, while of different scope, recite elements similar to those of claim 1 and are thus allowable over *Bogdan* for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. The remaining claims depend from these independent claims. These dependent claims therefore include all of the elements recited in their respective base claims. Accordingly, claims 3-8, 10-12, 14-17, 19-22, 24-26, and 28-37 are not anticipated by *Bogdan* at least due to their dependence from independent claims 1, 9, 13, 18, 23, and 27.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 13, 2009

By: 
Jeffrey A. Berkowitz
Reg. No. 36,743

Philip J. Hoffmann
Registration No. 46,340